## The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

OLIVER JOHNSON, Editor.

"NO UNION WITH SEAVEHOLDERS."

JAMES BARNARY, Publishing Agent

VOL. 5 -- NO. 34.

## SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO, MAY 4, 1850.

WHOLE NO. 242.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO. TERMS.

TERMS.

\$1,50 per annum, if paid within the first six months of the subscriber's year.

If paid before three months of the year has expired, a deduction of twenty-five cents will be made, reducing the price to \$1,25.

If payment be made in advance, or on the receipt of the first number, fifty cents will be disducted, making the subscription but \$1.

To any person wishing to examine the character of the paper, it will be furnished six months, for lifty cents in advance; to all others, saveny-five cents will be charged.

No deviation from those terms.

The We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-playery-trule, with the hope that they will eithor subscribe themselves, or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

The Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to OLIVER JORNSON, Editor. All others to James Bannary, Publishing Agent.

THE BUGLE.

The Wrongs of Woman.

AN ADDRESS

Delivered before the Ohio Women's Convention at Salem, April 19th, 1850.

BT J. ELIZABETH JONES.

Tarax is not, perhaps, in the wide field of reform, any one subject so difficult to discuss as that of Woman's Rights. I use the term "Woman's Rights," because it is a technical phrase. I like not the expression. It is not Woman's Rights of which I design to speak, but of Woman's Rights of which I design to speak, but of Woman's Rights of which I design to speak, but of Woman's Rights of the case of our sex—I shall demand the recognition of no rights on the ground of our womanhood. In the contest which is now being waged in behalf of the enalized culours man he this land, I have yet plored man in this land, I have yet enslaved colored man in this land, I have yet to hear the first word in favor of his rights as a colored man; the great point which is sought to be established is thus, that the colored man is a human being, and as such, entitled to the free exercise of all the rights which belong to humanity. And we should demand our recognition as equal members of the human family; as persons to whom pertain all the rights which grow out of our relations to God, and to each other, as human beings; and when this point is once established the terms. Waman's Rights? will be-

carefully conceal the secrets of her pris carefully conceal the secrets of her prison-house, but will ridicule the idea of woman's oppression. Do not misunderstand me: I I am very far from considering it proper to expect all our domestic matters for the inspection of the curious and the gossiping world; we have a right to couceal all we choose to conceal; but we have no right to play the hypocrite and pretend to despise an enterprise whose success we well know would lenefit the race. Why, the very fact that all the wealth of the family is in the hands of the husband, makes her a mere dependent—it places her in the most absurd and slavish position. She cannot even replenish her own wardrobe, or that of her children, without asking her husband for the means to do so. Should she desire to feed the hungry or clothe the naked, she must ask her husband for the means to enable her to do it. Should she desire the services of a seamit. Should she desire the services of a seam-stress or a nurse, she must ask her busband for the means to enable her to employ them. Is the babe of her bosom sick unto death, and she desires to secure the services of a skilful physician, she must ask her husband for the means to enable her to do it. If the for the means to enable her to do it. If the cause of peace, temperance, or anti-slavery has her warmest sympathies and earnest prayers, and she desires to give pecuniary aid to these enterprises, also must ask her husband for the means to enable her to do so. Mrs. Kirtland very justly remarks, in relation to this matter: "The Turk does not lock tion to this matter: "The Turk does not lock 'up his wives with more jealous care than the 'Christian husband his strong box from her 'whom he has formally endowed with all his 'earthly possessions. To this lock there is 'ever but one key, and that the master carties in his pocket." This is no fancy sketch; on the other hand, multitudes could be produced that would tell you this is only a faint shadow of the evil. And yet, woman has all the rights she desires! I have seen so much deception in regard to this matter, that when I hear a woman say that she has all the rights and privileges that she wishes to exercise, I

Let me say before I proceed further, that I do not mean to make any invidious comparisons between men and women. When I do not mean to make any invidious com-parisons between men and women. When I say that man sets the tyrant, I do not mean to deny that woman in similar circumstances would be as great a tyrant as he. Indeed I have known women who ruled the whole household with a rod of iron, as it were; and cases are not unfrequent in which the wrongs of man, rather than the rights of woman, should claim the sympathies of the philan-thropist. I am very far from arrogating any degree of perfection for my own sex. Nei-

exhibit the Blent chips to Links the earlier was shown in the case of the powers the second of the power is the second of the control has dead, we have go to in the called the power of the control has dead, we have go to in the called the power of the control has dead to be power of the control has dead to the power of the

its perfect work, and when the abolitionist beholds them, he ever renews nie vows at the altar of liberty—he resolves never to leave the warfare till slavery shall cease to

extent of her coslavement; it shows that a long train of abuses and marrations has completed the work of degradation—has blinded her to a sense of justice and of equal rights. The opinions and feelings that prevail among women in regard to this subject are, of course, very various. There are those weak and dependent souls, of whom I was speaking, who have such a passion for gallantry that they would not think of taking their rights if offered them. Then there are those to whom I have referred, whose spirits are daily crucified by the rule and dominion are daily crucified by the rule and dominion of man; yet fearing to expose their own sit-uation, vigorously oppose all efforts to de-stroy that rule and dominion. There is an-other class who feel, and feel very deeply, ing masculine, the great dread of seeming to be out of their sphere, the unpleasant remarks, perchance the ridicule and sarcasm, which they expect to meet, prevent them from giving utterance to their real sentiments. Then again there are those who have no sense of injury, because they have never felt it in their own persons. All their wants have been duly supplied; fathers, brothers, husbands, perchance, have done all that could be done to render them happy; for there are husbands, not a few, who scknowledge the equal right of the wife in all domestic relations; consequently the attened to this subject, and we do not have their aid and their influence. There is yet another class—those who labor for a mere pittance because they are women; they suffer oppression little less than absolute slavery, and they feel it too; their prayers and their voice we shall ever have in favor of our enterprise.

Now with all this diversity of opinion and

degree of perfaction for my own sex. Neighbor of women differ from the rights of men. It is then known rights for which we contend.

But the woman has no rights peculiar to her sex—none which helong to her because which are peculiar to her—wrongs, which are peculiar to her—wrongs political, wrongs social, aye, and wrongs resisting their individuality, and merge their existence into that of their husbands. It is feminate for the present time, there is on the part of a majority of women a passive yielding up of all their rights, a desire, I might say, to lose their individuality, and merge their existence into that of their husbands. It is feminate for the present time, there is on the part of a majority of women a passive yielding up of all their rights, a desire, I might say, to lose their individuality, and merge their existence into that of their husbands. It is feminate for the present time, there is on the part of a majority of women a passive yielding up of all their rights, a desire, I might say, to lose their individuality, and merge their existence into that of their husbands. It is feminate for the present time, there is on the part of a majority of women a passive yielding up of all their rights, a desire, I might say, to lose their individuality, and merge their existence into that of their husbands. It is feminate to the present time, there is on the part of a majority of the present time, there is on the part of a majority of two man. And we find also in the "political billet" of the properties of the government of the present time, there is on the part of a majority of two man and the government of the government of the government of the present time, there is on the part of the present time, there is on the part of the present time, there is on the part of the present time, there is on the part of the present time, there is on the part of the present time, there is on the part of the present of the present of the present of t

have just quoted, the wife is complete-sorbed in the husband, just as the slave sorbed in her master. "All contracts de with her, like those made with the te by her owner, are a mere nullity," at the contract be for the bare necess-of life suited to her condition.

refress without the husband's concurrence, and in his name as well as her own; neither esq she be sued without unking her husband a defendant." In crimnal prosecutions, the wife may be indicted and punisheds prately, unless there be evidence of co-creon from the fact that the offence was committed in the presence, and by the committed in the presence and by the committed in the presence and hy the committed in the presence and hy the committed in the presence and hy the command of her husband. A woman's hand, a woman's personal property, by marriage becomes absolutely her nusland'e, which at his death, he may leave entirely away from her."—Here are four points laid down by Blackston; as law,—and I ought quote many more of a similar character—and which are sanctioned as such by the community in which

of a similar character—and which are said tioned as such by the community in which we dve. I will briefly recapitulate. Ist, Words, by marriage entirely loses her legal existence. 2d. She cannot bring an action at his against the robber of her property, the defaurer of her character, or the assaulter the defauer of her chareter, or the assaulter of her person; and yet, in the 3d place, she may be punished separately for her own wrong doings, unless the husband assumes the control of her moral responsibility, as he has of her person and property, 4th, the busband may will away the property he received by his wife, and leave her and her children to beggary. The convict who is innunced in the Penitentiary, loses to a certain extent the rights of citizenship, when the prison doors close upon him, but not more wholly than does woman lose her legal existence when she enters the married state. Her name, her person, her property are no longer hers; the law gives them to another, and like the slave of the South "she can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what belongs to her master."—The institution of marriage I regard as in harmony with the perfect law of our being, as calculated to promote the highest interests and happiness of our race; but human

which the former complained, the wronging and from that day to the present time, taxistion without representation has been theoretrically abhorrent to every American Statesman. And we find also in the "politeal bible" of this people, the declaration that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But what, I ask, is the political condition of every woman in the land to-day? She is taxed without representation; and the government to which she is compelled to submit under penalty of death, hesitates not to exercise powers to which she, as one of the government to which she, as one of the government ax-gatherer does not come and demand a percentage of that which a father or a bus-

not as a wife, laving equal rights, with her husband, not as a woman, not as an independent being; but as one whose being is absorbed by another in whose name, by whose permission, and through whose authority she can alone there speak. She can demand redress for no outrage whatever, unless the husband shall first grant her permission to appeal, for justice to the courts, and consent that his name shall be used in the pro-

The American people are said above all others to love money. Having no hereditary nobility in the land, no peers of the realm, they have sought to build up an aristocracy of wealth, a democratic nobility, whose power of gold shall compensate for titles and coronets. It would be too berefaced a robbery to take from the unmarried woman har respect, so man waits until her faced a robbery to take from the unmarried woman her property, so man waits until her legal existence is absorbed in that of a husband, and then, in the name of affection, shamefully filches that to which he has no moral right. If a woman who is about to marry contemplates securing for her own use, while the law permits it, the means at her disposal, the world frowns upon berabe is told that her course evinces distrust, that she is practically impeaching the honor and the integrity of him who is about to become her husband. And thus is she duped by public opinion and debased by law. She is ashamed to maintain her rights before marriage, and she cannot maintain them afterward. Legislation has aimed to piace the wenith of the nation in the hands of man; and in the right to hold property, as in many other things, to make the woman a mere eypher.

mere cypher.

And not only does the law permit man to entirely control his wife's personal property and her daily earnings, but it declares, that to a great extent, the will of the dead husband is more to be regarded than the necessities of the surviving wife. By a stroke of the pen, he can reduce his wife from the opulence she enjoyed as his companion, to comparative poverty. And although the statute law of Ohio secures to her, at his death, a life-interest in one third of his real estate—and mark it, a life-interest only, no actual, bone fide right one third of his real estate—and mark it, a life-interest only, no actual, bona fide right of property, the right to sell, to will away, or otherwise dispose of, even though it came through her hand—although, I say, it secures her this, he may by will dispose of the two thirds, even though it be upon the wanton, who, perchance, robbed her of a husband's love, and make provision for the final disposal of the other third after her life interest in it ceases. And the wife dies with the bitter consciousness pressing heavily upon her, that of all the property which was the gift of a father's love, there is none she can leave her children to save them from destitution.

ence for woman—such the spirit of chivalry upon which he prides himself! The fact that some men are better than their laws, that there are those who repudiate all legal rights not based on exact justice, who treat their wives as equals, as rational beings, does not losson the injustice of the laws, or my

a special provision for the benefit of the wife. Such provision exists in Ohio. I have already intimated that preliminary arrangements may be made to obviate the helpless and dependent condition in which a woman is placed as soon as she is married.

"Jointures and settlements may be made for the benefit of the wife. A jointure is a separate provision made by the husband for the wife's support. A settlement is the separate provision made by the parents of the wife for her support. These may be made after marriage, but they are usually made before. The method is to place the portion set apart for the wife, under the control of trustees, who manage it independently of the husband for the benefit of the wife."

Indeed the control of trustees, mark you!

Under the control of trustees, mark you! another assumption of incapacity on the part of woman to manage her own property. But if this precaution for her own benefit be not taken, then by marriage all the wife's personal property becomes his absolutely. If not in possession, he may take measures to reduce it to possession. He can thus dispose of it in spite of her. If debts were due to her, he may collect them. If he was himself the debtor, the marriage concels the debt. If she has earned money by her own labor, during the marriage, he may collect it. Thus her personal property is entirely at his control. In respect to real estate, he may not encumber or dispose of

"On the other hand, the only claim the wife has upon her husband's property, is for a bare support"—just the necessaries suited to her condition. If she has brought him uncounted heaps of gold, she has a legal right only to enough for a bare subsistence.

I have taken the above facts from Walker's 'Introduction to American Law.'

Then again, the same author says:

'If the wife manifests a disposition to squandless are destroy property, he may use the

der or destroy property, he may use the means necessary to prevent her.

But how is it on the other hand? He may squander to any extent he sees fit, he may take bread from his children and sell it for runt, and she cannot restrain him. And again, the law gives him a right to her person; if she thinks he is too gross, and rude, and anstere, and brutish to hiv with, and consequently leaves him, he can seize her and bring her back and compel her to stay with him. Such law needs no comment; it is a diagrace to any civilized people.

there after creditors are satisfied, ir as not willed it away from her." I have said that the first act of the

has not wiled it away from her.

I have said that the first act of those who formed this government was, to deny to woman the right of the elective franchise. All lot or part she has in the government is, to be counted in the Congressional representation; an honor for which we—the free women—ought to be very grateful, seeing that each of us is counted as one, while the alays is counted as only three-fifths of a being.—No governmental offices of honor, trust or profit are accessible to us. The Executive chair, Legislative hell, and Judicial bench are not for woman. The duties and the salarics pertaining thereto belong exclusively to men. All the official honors that woman can hope to enjoy must come through her husband; his light alone must be like the self-created brightness of the sun.

So far from having access to the Judicial bench, she cannot hope to enter the jury-box; and there is not a woman in the land, whe was ever brought before a court for trial, whether she was guilty or not guilty of the charges alleged against her, that has ever had such a trial as she had a right to claim.—First, a body of men prefer a charge against her; then another body of men are aworn to try her. All the officers of the court, from the tipstaff with his stave to the Judge upon the bench, are men. Her prosecutor is a man, and the lawyer who defends her case is a man. Now all this is wrong. Where a man is to be indicted, tried and sentenced, if his prefers it, let it be done by men; but when a woman has violated the law, I claim that she has a right, if she so chooses, to be indicted—if indicted at all—by women, and also to be tried by a jury of women. Who, I ask, gave man the exclusive right to sit in judgment upon us? Who gave him the exclusive authority to condemn and punish woman?

In very many trials, where women are arraigned as criminals, it is manifestly more in accordance with what the world calls propriety, and would better answer the ends of justice, if none but women were officially connected with them. But we miss

ledgment of her God-given equality, did an Esau exchange his birthrigh

did an Esau exchange has poorer mess of pottage.

The occasion that has brought us togeth at this time is of no mean importance. Torganic law of the State—the Constitution Ohio, which imposes upon those of us whave property, in our own right, taxati without representation, which establish laws for our government without our constitution.

The entire course of man's legislation, not only is this country but in others, betchens an almost entire forgetfulness of the fact that woman has rights that should be respected, rights that belong to her by virtue of her humanity.

The common law, of which I have been speaking is in force every where, as I understand it except where there is a statute law, a special provision for the benefit of the when the question is to be discussed and settled as to who are to comprise the government, who shall be admitted to the elective franchise, and who denied, why should it be left only to the voters under the present Constitution to decide who shall be the delegates to that Convention? This is a subject that deeply interests every inhabitant of the territory over which the new Constitution is to be established. For those who constitution is to be established. For those who constitute the government to decide that they and they alone shall be represented in that Convention, is simply tyranny, and manifests a strong desire to retain in their own hands the power they have grasped.

But whatever may be the character of that Convention, whatever may be its decision upon those questions involving the rights of humanity, we know that the opinion and the action of those I am now addressing will, if conceived in a liberal spirit, enunciated with firmness, and unshrinkingly maintained, produce an effect upon the hearts of the people, and lead them to see, in a higher and truer light, the rights and the responsibilities that belong to us.

What then do we ask at the hands of the

belong to us.
What then do we ask at the hands of the What then do we ask at the hands of the State Convention? Simply a recognition of our equality, a practical adoption of the doctrine, that as in Christianity, so in true Democracy, there is neither male nor female. If governments are necessary for the protection of mankind, if laws are essential to the well-being of society, we ask that our right to share in the formation and administration of governments he acknowledged; and that the laws to which we are compelled to submit shall emanate not from a favored class, but from the whole people. If universal suffrage be the safeguard to interty—and we are assured it is—we ask that it be in truth universal, open alike to woman as to man. And should the Convention see fit to refuse compliance with our requests, we man. And should the Convention see it to refuse compliance with our requests, we should demand of its members a sight of the charter, which gives man the exclusive right to rule. Let them meet the question fairly; let them tell if they can, what better right men have to establish a government, and deny women the right to participate in

and bring her back and compel her to stay with him. Such law needs no comment; it is a disgrace to any civilized people.

Let us fix the following points indelibly in our minds. Woman, married, or single, has no political rights whatsoever. While single her legal rights are the seme as those of man. When married, her legal rights are chiefly suspended. When she becomes a widow, those rights revive, and some provision is made for her support. She has a life interest in one third part of the real estate, owned by her husband. If there be only personal property, she has a certain.

[Condusted on fourth page.]